



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/138,926	08/24/1998	FRANK C. CESARE	D-6362	4707

7590

10/21/2002

RAYMOND D. THOMPSON
UNIROYAL CHEMICAL COMPANY INC
WORLD HEADQUARTERS
MIDDLEBURY, CT 06749

EXAMINER

NOLAN, SANDRA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

18

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AS-18

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/138,926

Applicant(s)

CESARE

Examiner

Sandra M. Nolan

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims

1. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Rejection Withdrawn

2. The 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1-30 as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention, as set out in section 5 of the May 24, 2002 Office Action (Paper No. 16), is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendments in the response dated July 31, 2002 (Paper No. 17).

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

What does "a high molecular weight polymer" mean? How high is high?

Please clarify the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1772

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen (EPO 0246745 B1).

Allen is discussed in section 4 of the February 23, 2000 Office Action (Paper No. 3). It fails to teach the viscosity average molecular weight claimed or the amounts and types of fibers claimed.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to employ any conventional fibers, such as aramid fibers, in suitable amounts, in the compositions of Allen in order to reinforce them.

The motivation to select aramid fibers as reinforcers for the Allen compositions is based upon aramid fibers' well known reinforcing properties.

It is deemed desirable to reinforce the Allen compositions with reinforcers in order to produce articles having high strength properties.

The selection of a terpolymer of suitable viscosity average molecular weight is deemed a matter of engineering choice, depending upon the properties desired in the final composition.

Art Unit: 1772

8. Claims 14 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frances (US 4,514,541) in view of Allen.

Frances teaches the use of 5-75% (col. 1, line 67) ethylene/propylene/diene rubber (col. 1, line 62) along with 10-60% of aramid pulp (col. 2, line 1) in masterbatches for blending with other elastomers (col. 2, lines 3-6). It fails to teach the terpolymers claimed or the viscosity average molecular weight claimed.

Allen is discussed above. The Allen compositions are said to have improved processability (page 2, lines 41+).

The patents are analogous because they both deal with terpolymers of ethylene and propylene with polyenes.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to employ the terpolymers of Allen in the masterbatches of Frances in order to produce aramid reinforced compositions that have improved processability.

The motivation to employ the terpolymers of Allen in the masterbatches of Frances is found at page 2, lines 41+ of Allen, where the compositions that employ the Allen terpolymers are said to have improved processability.

It is deemed desirable to make compositions having improved processability in order to facilitate their handling prior to molding.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to the Examiner, Sandra M. Nolan, whose telephone number is 703/308-9545. The Examiner can

Art Unit: 1772

normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm, Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at 703/308-4251. The general fax number for the art unit is 703/305-5436. The fax number for after final communications is 703/872-9310. The receptionist answers 703/308-0661.



S. M. Nolan
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700

SMN/smn
09138926(18)
October 19, 2002